

CULTURAL VALUE ORIENTATION ANALYSIS OF A HUNGARIAN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION: A CASE STUDY

Ildikó FURKA

Centre for Foreign Languages, University of Technology and Economics
ildifurka@hotmail.com

Abstract

Stemming from personal interest, this exploratory case study (Creswell, 2007) aimed to explore everyday cases of dissatisfaction such as the alleged lack of respect towards teachers, and students' unwillingness to study, or the differing expectations of students, teachers and parents in a state secondary school in Budapest, Hungary. The research was intended (1) to showcase situations where expectations were 'off', and (2) to highlight the possible sources of misunderstandings or problematic forms of behaviour. Thus, it set out to examine whether the complaints of teachers and students could be analyzed in terms of cultural value orientation theory (Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov, 2010; Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998; Hall, 1976; Furka, 2013), and if so, which dimensions were detectable. Data collection involved the triangulation of data from questionnaires filled in by students (aged 14-18) and teachers in the same institution, as well as interviews with focus groups and individual teachers. Data analysis applied the constant comparative method of Grounded Theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Creswell, 2007) for the interviews, and general statistical procedures for the questionnaires. Results show that differences in power distance and uncertainty avoidance in the stakeholders' value systems might be responsible for the dissatisfaction. If they are not addressed explicitly, such value differences might lead to a decrease in performance output and job satisfaction, as well as a deteriorating school image.

1 Introduction – context and the problem

I started out in the world of language schools and corporate language teaching in Hungary and obtained some international experience later on. As a language learner I had many native speaker teachers from all around the world, as well as some Canadian relatives to practice with. As a result, I instinctively developed a second identity while learning English and acquired some of its cultural values (Brown, 1986). In addition, as Rogoff (1990) and Nespors (1987) also suggest, I started teaching as I was taught, mimicking a lot of the native teachers' teaching practices and the values behind them (Vygotsky, 1980; Rogers, 1983). When I started working in Hungarian state secondary education, I encountered circumstances that I had different reactions to than my colleagues, which forced me to consider the situation. For example, the staffroom was always echoing with how this or that student did not behave respectfully, or failed to do their homework, or kept demanding that their rights be observed whereas they did not fulfill their responsibilities. At the end of the outbursts such general statements were uttered as "this generation is not like ours used to be" or "who do they think they are?"

Reflecting on the recurring staffroom discussions I identified six topics as distinguishable concerns: (1) the alleged discrepancy between education and real-life needs, (2) problems with rote learning, (3) students' lack of skill in manipulating data, (4) students' lack of respect towards teachers, (5) recommended teaching methods and available books not suitable for preparing students for school-leaving exams, and (6) students overburdened with workload, and their complaints considered as "whining". These issues caused constant dissatisfaction in both parties, resulting in mistrust and finger-pointing. The situation became very similar to instances of miscommunication or communication breakdown between interlocutors from different cultural backgrounds (Hofstede, 1980). Therefore, I set out to investigate whether these rifts may be linked to value differences between the stakeholders, and if they can be categorized along the lines of cultural dimensions. The following specific research questions emerged:

1. Could the rift manifested in the complaints from teachers and students in a Hungarian state secondary institution be connected to value differences between the participants?
2. If so, can the value differences behind the rift manifested in the complaints from teachers and students in a Hungarian state secondary institution be linked to cultural dimensions?

2 Theoretical background: cultural value orientations framework

In the business world, communication breakdown due to cultural differences has been in the limelight for 40 years, and entire fields of research have developed around the concept. Business management (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010; Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998; Jarjabka, 2010), social psychology (Schwartz & Sagiv, 1995; Schwartz, 2006; Inglehart, 2008), intercultural communication studies (Bennett, 1986; Chen & Starosta, 1998), the field of cross-cultural pedagogy (Grobman, 2001; Gay, 2010; Hohman, 2013), second language acquisition (SLA) (Brown, 2000; Tarone & Yule, 1989), and foreign language teaching methodology (Furka, 2013; Holló, 2008, 2014; Lázár, 2006; Barrett et al., 2014; Byram, 1997) all set out to examine the phenomena brought about by differing cultural backgrounds.

Culture is defined as "the behaviours and beliefs characteristic of a particular social, ethnic or age group" (www.dictionary.com). It can take many forms and shapes. In the educational environment, we might distinguish *classroom culture*, i.e., the collective rules and features that implicitly or explicitly govern activities in the classroom, define educational values, beliefs and processes, such as teacher's instructions, accepted behaviour by students, or attitudes to classroom events (Levin, 2009). In addition, pedagogical literature distinguishes *cultures of learning* where various values and beliefs are attached to learning methods, goals and textbooks, and thus form part of the so-called "hidden curriculum" (Cortazzi & Jin, 1996). *School culture* on the other hand is described by Fullan (2007) as the guiding beliefs and values evident in the way a school operates (as cited in Waldron & McLeskey, 2010, p.2). Finally, the unit of *national culture* comes into the picture, defined as "the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from others" (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010, p.6), and is equally important since national culture permeates all organizational culture units, and thus educational systems and schools themselves (Minkov, 2013).

The characteristics of culture can be grouped into dimensions. Furka (2013) provides an overview of the dimensions that scientific literature has worked with both quantitatively and qualitatively, and provides an analytical framework with which cultural value orientations and the problems arising from such variations can be understood. She shows that the 12 dimensions most widely used in research are:

- (1) *low* versus *high power distance* (LPDI-HPDI), which refers to the extent to which societies or groups accept the fact that power is distributed unequally among members of the society (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010).
- (2) *collectivist* versus *individual*, based on the idea that some cultures have stronger ties (COLL) between members of the society than others (IDV) (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010).
- (3) *feminine* versus *masculine*, depicting tendencies of the distribution of emotional roles of being caring and more modest (FEM) or assertive and competitive (MAS) (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010).
- (4) *specific* versus *diffuse* (SPEC-DIFF), where *specific* cultures compartmentalize the areas of life and engage others to various degrees, whereas in *diffuse* ones the boundaries are less clear (Trompenaars & Woolliams, 2003).
- (5) *achievement* versus *ascription* (ACH-ASCR), where the former focuses on what one achieves with their actions as opposed to what one is ascribed to or was born into (Trompenaars & Woolliams, 2003).
- (6) *high context* and *low context* (HCON-LCON) cultures where the latter use explicit codes to convey the mass of information, whereas *high* context-dependent cultures code the message in the physical context, or it is already internalized in the person (Hall, 1966).
- (7) *universalism* versus *particularism* (UNIV-PART), depending on how far cultures tend to "follow the rules" regardless of the participants or the particular situation (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998).
- (8) *neutral* versus *affective* (NEUTR-AFF), where the former does not show either positive or negative emotions to the outside world (Trompenaars & Woolliams, 2003).
- (9) *inner* versus *outer direction* (INNER-OUTER), where *inner* orientation means that nature can be dominated and the point of departure for determining correct action is the person. *Outer* orientation means a greater entity that we cannot influence or change controls our lives (Trompenaars & Woolliams, 2003).
- (10) *short* or *long-term* oriented cultures (STO-LTO), where the former hold past and present values such as national pride, respect for tradition, fulfilling social obligation, and the preservation of "face" (Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998) in high esteem. *Long-term* oriented cultures focus on issues related to the future, such as saving up, persistence and adapting to changing circumstances. (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010).
- (11) *uncertainty tolerating* or *avoiding* (low-high UAI) (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010).
- (12) *monochronic* versus *polychronic* cultures (MONO_POLY), where the former tend to use time as a linear scheduling framework and focus on intensified contact with one, two or maximum three people at a time (Hall, 1966).

Furka (2013) also highlights the problem of using dimensions as a concept, which Hofstede (1995) had earlier addressed as well. It must be taken into consideration that analysis of cultural variations with the help of dimensional scores is only meaningful at a comparative group level. In other words, scores on the dimensional positions of each country are meaningless in themselves. They only signify something when compared to other nations' or groups' scores, i.e., the tendencies the countries/groups show may be compared. For example, Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov (2010) assign Hungary a score of 46 for power distance on a scale of 100. In itself this does not reveal whether Hungary is low power distant or not. Only when Hungary is compared to another country, say Japan with its score of 54, can it be said that Hungary has a tendency for lower power distance than Japan, as a result of which certain situations might be handled differently in the two cultures. Sondergaard (1994) also highlights that using cultural dimensions as an analytical tool may be fairly applied when more groups or units are investigated.

Some criticize discussion of the notion of national cultures as promoted by the Hofstedeian framework, as they fear it fosters stereotypical thinking and might lead to prejudiced behaviour (Shaumjan, 2006). Others emphasize the danger of ethnocentrism in approaching culture as a measurable construct, claiming the instruments used for measuring it might reflect only one type of thinking, that of the researcher, and might disregard other interpretations of a certain phenomenon (Jones, 2007). However, although both claims are certainly justified if research is done incorrectly, with proper care stereotypes can be successfully used in raising awareness of cultural value differences (Furka, 2013), and intercultural research groups can help to avoid ethnocentric research protocols (Bond, 1987).

3 Research design

As the study aims to generate a hypothesis and explore a phenomenon, its research design followed the exploratory case study (Creswell, 2007; Yin, 2003; Flyvbjerg, 2006). The specific research questions investigated were (1) whether differing cultural value orientations may be responsible for the issues identified in the staff room discourse, and (2) if so, whether these value differences can be described with the help of cultural dimensions. Participatory action research (PAR) was also involved (Creswell, 2007), since the researcher was part of the researched community and context. To keep transferability, credibility and trustworthiness of qualitative research in the forefront (Szokolszky, 2004), the grounded theory approach put forward by Glaser and Strauss (1967) was employed inasmuch as a wide range of sources of data were analyzed, ensuring triangulation of sources and methods (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Data sources consisted of a questionnaire on value orientations, and open-ended focus group and individual interviews were also carried out, in some cases with questionnaire respondents. Data analysis involved basic statistical calculations on the questionnaire data, and the constant comparative method and a thick description (Geertz, 1973) of the interviews were employed in the analysis to ensure traceability (Boeije, 2002).

It is often said that case studies are context-dependent and less valuable than context-independent, general research, or that single-case studies cannot be generalized and therefore are not useful for scientific development. However, it cannot be denied that case studies do constitute an important element of human expert learning because it is by studying several cases that expert knowledge is formulated (Flyvbjerg, 2006). Furthermore, to all intents and purposes social science simply cannot yield context-independent knowledge and theory, but this does not mean it should be disregarded. The use of case study research is justified by the wealth of detail (Creswell, 2007) that can be obtained using various data collection methods and by the fact that it easily lends itself to the investigation of multiple facets of a phenomenon (Yin, 2003).

3.1 Instruments, participants and data collection

The present paper focuses on the value differences of the two groups present in an educational setting that I am a part of and have access to. The institution is situated in the north-western part of Budapest, the capital of Hungary. It has 627 students in 6-year programs and 4-year programs, aged from 13–18 or 19. Students are placed in 19–20 classes of 34–36, depending on how many students apply in a year. There is a central entrance exam to gain admission; there have been enough applicants to fill classes for the past 10 years. Applying students choose the school either for its location or for academic reasons. Most of the students are either from the neighbourhood of the school (30%) or the agglomeration lying to the north-west of the capital (30%), or they favour one of our classes specializing in foreign languages, History and Maths or Maths and Physics. The teaching staff consists of 52 teachers, 20% of whom are former students.

Data collection took the form of a survey questionnaire (Dörnyei, 2005) on the one hand, and a focus group and individual interviews (Szokolszky, 2004) on the other to ensure triangulation of data sources (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

The survey instrument consisted of a two-part Likert-scale questionnaire in Hungarian with 36 statement pairs on cultural value orientations grouped according to the 12 dimensions listed by Furka (2013) (see Section 2). Three statement pairs belonged to each dimension. The statements were formulated in such a way as to signify the poles of the given dimension. The Likert scale of four scores (1–4) was placed between the two statements of each pair. Thus, choosing score 1 or 2 meant the respondent felt closer to the statement on the left, whereas choosing scores 3 or 4 meant they agreed more with the statement on the right. For each dimension score 1 meant the pole mentioned first in the name of the dimensions (e.g. low versus high PDI: score 1 = low power distance, score 4 = high power distance, or FEM–MAS: score 1 = femininity: score 4 = masculinity).

The items were originally created by SIETAR, the Society for Intercultural Education, Training and Research based on Hofstede's Value Survey Module (VSM94); they were subsequently translated into Hungarian and applied in research by Groniewsky (2001). I revised, amended and piloted the questionnaire for use in EFL teaching (Furka, 2013) as part of my doctoral studies. For this particular piece of research, I reformulated some items to match the target participants. The second part of the questionnaire contained statistical questions about participants' gender and age and whether they wanted to hear about the results of the research, and provided space where they could describe anything else concerning their educational experience. Having two groups to survey, I arrived at a questionnaire with two versions, one addressing students and one teachers (see Appendix A and B respectively).

The questionnaire was administered to secondary school students from grade 9 (aged 15) and above through grade 12 online via the school's social media platform. 85 questionnaires were filled in. Younger respondents were excluded from the survey due to the fact that some notions in the items required more advanced conceptual development than 7th and 8th graders might be capable of at the age of 13 and 14. For teachers, a link was disseminated via the staff circular email to direct them to the online questionnaire.

Furthermore, interviews with three groups of students and three individual teachers supplemented the surveys. Student interviewees were selected with the method of convenience sampling (Dörnyei, 2005), that is, groups of students I teach were interviewed during school time in Hungarian. As the survey was done anonymously, there were no data on how many of the interviewed students had actually filled in the questionnaire. The three interview groups consisted of 42 10th, 11th and 12th graders (aged 16 to 18/19), with 16 boys and 26 girls. For the teacher interviews I asked fellow teachers

if and when they could manage to find a suitable time slot to conduct the interview. Again, it is unclear whether they filled in the questionnaire or not.

The interviews were recorded in open-ended semi-structured sessions in Hungarian where the leading question prompted students to disclose their 'problems' with their teachers or the system, in other words their educational experience (see Appendix C). With any issue that was unclear to me during the interview or arose during the session that seemed worth exploring from a value orientation point of view, I asked for explanations, such as 'What do you mean by that?' or 'Could you please elaborate on that?' Sometimes I would reiterate the interviewee's statement and ask for confirmation, such as 'So, you mentioned that... and that meant for you that..., is that correct?' Depending on whether I paraphrased the issue according to their originally intended meaning, respondents said yes or elaborated on how I might have misunderstood or ignored an aspect that was important to them and they therefore had a chance to reiterate their views. For example, to the question "What are your problems with your teachers?" one student asked back whether they should consider the teaching skills or the personality of the teacher. I replied that both aspects were certainly important; therefore they should consider both. Then the following interaction took place (as the interviews were carried out in Hungarian, the interactions quoted in the following are my translations):

Student A: *"In many cases the teacher behaves as a normal human being, but is not able to teach properly."*

Student B: *"Or the other way around. Both."*

Others strongly agreed with nods or saying "yeah" all around the group. At this point I interrupted with:

Interviewer: *"So both, you said (to student B), then let's clarify what you mean. You say that a certain teacher is OK as a person, but cannot teach, or they don't want to? (waiting for confirmation of my idea expressed in my question.)"*

Student A: *"Both. They don't want to or they can't."*

Student B: *"Others are not completely normal, (laughter in the group) and cannot teach either."*

Interviewer: *"So the teacher is 'not normal' and cannot or does not want to teach. And which one is problematic for you? The fact that they cannot teach, or they don't want to teach, or that they are not OK as a person?"*

Student B: *"That they cannot teach and as a person are not OK."*

Interviewer: *"And if they don't want to teach? That's OK?"*

All the students: *"Yeah that is also a problem."*

Student A: *"GB tries to teach chemistry, but he can't because the class is not interested in it at all."*

Student B: *"GB does not teach, meaning he does not discipline the class when we do not pay attention. He is alright as a person, though, but he does not make an effort to discipline us."*

Interviewer: *"So he is very OK as a person, but he cannot discipline you because you cannot behave yourselves. Should you behave yourselves?"*

Student B: *"We don't want to."*

Interviewer: *"Okay, okay, but should you?"*

Student C: *"It's so easy not to!"*

Interviewer: *"But should you?"*

Student D: *"Yeah we should. But we can't at this age."*

Student E: *"It's up to him if we cannot control ourselves."*

Interviewer: *"It's up to him? I'm sorry to jump onto certain expressions that you use...Why is it up to him that the class does not stay quiet and pay attention?"*

Student C: *"Because if he cannot maintain discipline, we will never learn that we should be quiet in the lessons."*

Interviewer: *"Why should he discipline you and not you yourself?"*

Everybody: *"Because he is the teacher. And it disturbs him, not us."*

Student A: *"Well, it disturbs me as well."*

Student F: *"But those stay quiet who are disturbed by noise and the lack of discipline."*

(Indistinguishable parallel conversations within the group, I pay attention and grab onto the next emerging topic).

Interviewer: *"So Geography is a problem?"*

Everybody: *"Yeah, she [the teacher] is a problem!...."*

3.2 Methods of data analysis

Both the student and teacher questionnaires covered 12 dimensions of value orientation with 3-3 statement pairs for each dimension. The three items connected to each dimension (for instance items 1-3 were about power distance) were calculated for means, medians and modes. Calculating these mathematical values helps interpret the answers of the respondents. The mean provides the numerical average of the answers. The median helps to highlight the dividing line that cuts the data in half, whereas the mode provides the most frequently chosen option, thereby illustrating the preference on the dimension (Szokolszky, 2004). All these together constitute the tendency of the group of respondents on the researched dimensions. The results of the student group for each dimension were compared to the ones of the teacher group.

The interviews were analyzed with the constant comparative method of grounded theory (Kolb, 2012) to find categories of values in the reported ideas. Looking for categories was based on the definitions of the 12 dimensions listed above in Section 2 (for the complete definition of each dimension see Furka, 2013).

4 Results

4.1 Questionnaires

The student questionnaire was filled in by 85 students (about 17% of the target group) aged 15-20, 28 of whom were male and 57 female. 16 respondents did not give their ages. Out of the 52 members of teaching staff, 13 filled in the questionnaire (25%). 1 respondent was male, the rest female. One respondent gave her age as 25-9, one as 45-49 and one as 65-69. The others chose not to give their ages.

The mean, the median and the mode for the students' scores on the items of the questionnaire are listed in Tables 1-3 below. The dimensions are marked with the name of one end of the poles in the tables, for instance, LPDI stands for the dimension of power distance where score 1 signals the low end of the dimensional continuum and means a preference for low power distance, and score 4 means high power distance. Similarly, score 1 in COLL refers to emphasis on collectivism rather than on individualism (score 4), score 1 in FEM means a preference for femininity and score 4 means masculinity etc. In other words, the higher the score, the more it marks the other end of the dimension, not the one at the top of the columns.

Table 1 lists the means of the students' and the teachers' answers. The students' means are approx. +0.3 higher towards monochronic orientation, approx. +0.4 higher towards high power distance, specific, neutral, and inner orientation, approx. +0.5 higher towards achievement and universalism. The dimensions of collectivism, femininity, context dependence, short term orientation and uncertainty avoidance

show less than 0.2 difference in either direction, which indicates very similar values between the two groups.

MEAN	LPDI	COLL	FEM	SPEC	ACH	LCON	UNIV	NEUTR	INNER	STO	UAI	MONO
Students	2.333	2.165	1.463	2.400	1.616	2.373	2.773	2.678	1.988	3.122	1.776	2.451
Teachers	1.949	2.077	1.641	2.000	1.179	2.410	2.256	2.231	1.590	3.205	1.615	2.179

Table 1. Means of responses on the 12 dimensions of the student and teacher questionnaires.

Abbrev. LPDI: low power distance, COLL: collectivism, FEM: femininity, SPEC: specific, ACH: achievement, LCON: low context, UNIV: universalism, NEUTR: neutral, INNER: inner orientation, STO: short term orientation, UAI: uncertainty avoidance, MONO: monochronic.

Table 2 lists the medians of students' and teachers' answers. On the dimensions of power distance, collectivism-individualism, femininity-masculinity, specific-diffuse, achievement-ascription, context dependence, and short versus long term orientation the medians are the same. Universalism, neutral, inner orientation and uncertainty avoidance are 1 score higher for the student population, tending towards universalism, neutral, inner orientation and uncertainty avoiding ends of the dimensions.

MEDIAN	LPDI	COLL	FEM	SPEC	ACH	LCON	UNIV	NEUTR	INNER	STO	UAI	MONO
Students	2	2	1	2	1	2	3	3	2	3	2	2
Teachers	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	1	3	1	2

Table 2. Medians of responses on the 12 dimensions of the student and teacher questionnaires.

Abbrev. LPDI: low power distance, COLL: collectivism, FEM: femininity, SPEC: specific, ACH: achievement, LCON: low context, UNIV: universalism, NEUTR: neutral, INNER: inner orientation, STO: short term orientation, UAI: uncertainty avoidance, MONO: monochronic.

Table 3 lists the modes of students' and teachers' answers. The modes are the same for both groups on power distance, collectivism-individualism, femininity-masculinity, achievement-ascription, context dependence, inner versus outer orientation and uncertainty avoidance. There is a preference for specific, universalism, neutral, short term orientation and monochronic orientation with higher student scores in these cases.

MODE	LPDI	COLL	FEM	SPEC	ACH	LCON	UNIV	NEUTR	INNER	STO	UAI	MONO
Students	2	2	1	2	1	2	3	3	1	4	1	2
Teachers	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	3	1	1

Table 3. Modes of responses on the 12 dimensions of the student and teacher questionnaires.

Abbrev. LPDI: low power distance, COLL: collectivism, FEM: femininity, SPEC: specific, ACH: achievement, LCON: low context, UNIV: universalism, NEUTR: neutral, INNER: inner orientation, STO: short term orientation, UAI: uncertainty avoidance, MONO: monochronic.

The second part of the questionnaire contained an option for open-ended answers concerning what other problems respondents might have in connection with their educational experience. Some students remarked that teachers should pay more attention to students since not everyone might get the necessary amount of attention at home. Another expressed opinion was that education is set by external factors that limit students' free time, which puts psychological pressure on them. Furthermore, it was mentioned that the problems of student-teacher relationships are often influenced by the system within which the participants have to operate, which overloads not only students but teachers as well. As a result, students sometime turn their anger on the closest stakeholder within reach, that is, the teacher, even though in many cases the teachers do not agree with the system either. In addition, some mentioned that a renovation and more comfortable chairs and sofas would be welcome to make the school more attractive to spend time in. Others expressed a need for the student organization to do more in order to create a student community; yet another respondent expressed a similar view mentioning that there is hardly enough time for students to socialize even though they crave it. Finally, another comment referred to the need to hire expert teachers who do not degrade the reputation of the school. Teachers' answers in the open-ended 'other problems' section highlighted the fact that student-teacher relationships are more complicated than a questionnaire can reveal, that some items were "too trendy", or that the wording suggested the answer already. The fact that the relationship between teachers and students is a multifaceted process could explain why no further elaboration was given in this section and no other problematic issues arose. Concerning the 'trendiness' of the items, some items might have triggered this remark. For instance, Q8 showed two poles:

Boys can be caring and thoughtful, and can be interested in their environment and the weaker around them; it does not make them less of a man.

versus

A boy should be tough, assertive and a high achiever, he should not pay attention to such things as the beauty of the environment around him or supporting the weaker.

whereas Q33 had the following two poles:

I do not mind change, or unknown and unexpected situations.

versus

I do not adjust well to change, unexpected or unknown situations.

These items might have been viewed as 'trendy' as a result of being part of mainstream and social media on an everyday basis. Why the items might have been suggestive, i.e. making the respondents answer in a certain way, cannot be clarified due to the anonymity of the questionnaire. Before future application of the questionnaire, the issue might be addressed via the think-aloud method of piloting a questionnaire (Dörnyei, 2005).

4.2 Student interviews

Student interviews revealed several issues of being looked down on by teachers, or not being treated as equals when they would like to express their opinions. Student I mentioned that *"Some teachers explicitly look down on us, some just think they are above us because they are adults and teachers, but at least behave in an OK way,*

you can manage things with them otherwise." Teachers get upset when students do not greet them in the corridors but they do not greet students either, which students felt reflects a double standard. This was illustrated in several comments: Student B said *"She expects us to do things she cannot do herself successfully,"* or student G: *"A teacher needs to behave consistently,"* or Student H: *when teachers are late for the lesson, we cannot say anything about that!"*)

They also complained that some teachers are so burnt-out that their lack of motivation to teach is obvious. Student H: *"The Geography teacher comes into a lesson three minutes late and leaves ten minutes early. And still writes in the e-register if we were late for the lesson...."* Students expressed that this is not fair towards them. They might not always be motivated to learn the way the teachers expect them to, they said, but not teaching properly will definitely not create more motivation in them. In addition, students claimed that if they had a problem with a staff member, most of the time it was not possible to discuss problematic or unjust situations. For example, in one case students were 9 minutes late for a PE lesson. The teacher was very angry with them and recorded their being late and even reproached them for it, when the students claimed they were late because they did not have the proper information as to which gym room to go to. At the next opportunity, however, they did not initiate a discussion with the teacher. Student B: *"There are things we do not say to the teacher, because it becomes worse afterwards."* Students feel it is easier to keep quiet and suffer through compulsory education than to express their opinions for fear of worsening the case or receiving retribution. When asked what their parents said in these cases, they replied that parents also supported the option of staying quiet, based on their own past educational experiences.

Another issue raised by the students was the general status of being overburdened with seemingly unnecessary subjects and the depth of subject material. Student A said: *"We just spoke about it yesterday, how the expectations are getting higher and higher. For example, the plus points for a language exam will be taken away as the language exam will be compulsory for anyone applying to university. My sister could get them, but for me it's going to be harder."* They also feel that memorizing too many details and reiterating them for oral exams does not prepare them for identifying logical connections, their competence-based final exams or real life situations. When they remark on any of this they are reprimanded, as student A said: *"We are labelled as the weak generation, because our parents don't beat us at home!"* or student B said: *"Shouldn't it be a teacher's responsibility to teach us differently if the way they were handled was not so good? No, instead they keep telling us how we are below them for not having to endure the same negative things in our childhood as they had to. I don't think that's fair to us."*

Finally, the interviews highlighted the students' need for more varied teaching methods to prevent monotony. They did not complain about frontal teaching methods per se but they are open to new, experimental methods, and the common denominator was that whatever the method of teaching, it should be clarified what the expectations at exams would be. Student I said: *"They have been teaching with the same methods for two hundred years, but the exams have changed. The methods haven't."* Student B: *"The building looked the same, the desks were the same, when this building was put up."* They explicitly disliked it when they had to simply read the textbook and think for themselves, and then tests asked questions which they felt were unrelated to the topic or the way they approached it during lessons or through the textbook. The importance of tests covering what they had been taught, that is content validity (Szokolszky, 2004), was a recurring issue in the interviews.

4.3 Teacher interviews

Teachers revealed a number of things in the interviews. Firstly, Nora, a young colleague, mentioned that the biggest problem she faces is keeping discipline in her classes. She believes this is due to her age being very close to that of her students, which makes it difficult for them to maintain the hierarchy of the student-teacher relationship. In addition, she said, *"resulting from my personality, I prefer to work along with the students, treat them as being my equal, which has so far turned out to be difficult for them to adapt to."* It seems to her that their expectations of a teacher do not match that of a less hierarchical relationship. She said: *"I have to discipline them, because they do not know how to do it. The 7th graders are so hyper, that they cannot adjust to this frontal educational system."* When asked if it is her task to discipline them instead of the students disciplining themselves, she replied: *"the students feel how far they can stretch the boundaries with each teacher and they feel they can do it a lot more with me than with others, which disturbs me, because I don't feel in charge, which is the expected power set-up in a classroom."* Another issue she faces is how to gain their respect *"if they hate school as it is. I don't think I'm doing anything against them, I try to help them in every way to adjust to requirements, yet I feel they hate me just because I am a teacher."* When she was asked in what situations or cases she feels 'OK', she said: *"It is true I have a good relationship with many students precisely because I don't create such a strongly hierarchical structure in my attitude towards them, and they like the fact that I listen to them, allow them to let off steam to me if they have any problems with their studies or their lives. But with the 7th graders it is a problem at the moment."* Finally, she mentioned how the system feels too tightly controlled for her and that it should give more freedom to teachers to decide what and how to teach and behave with their students, to make them feel they are trusted.

Ella, a colleague with almost 40 years of experience, mentioned that times have indeed changed; for example, social processes and interaction, the appearance of the celebrity world, and the fact that families do not function properly. She said *"families do not teach their children to work hard for things but instead provide them with everything they wish for."* Thus, students do not learn the value of hard work, which translates into demotivation in school. *"In the past one had to study and work hard to achieve something,"* Ella said, whether that meant becoming a Nobel Prize-winning scientist or the local grocer, but one had goals which one had to toil for. She feels these days it seems that *"the younger generations receive every whim without exerting themselves, they even think knowledge is something they should get, instead of something valuable to work for."* So, it has increasingly become the teacher's role to teach the value of hard work to students with his/her actions, as a role model. She commented that

[t]eachers need work to teach not only their subject, but also to think. I usually tell my students that I don't teach them Pythagoras' theorem so that they can frighten their grand-children to death with it in the future, but because it is a mathematical subtopic that I can use excellently to make them practice logical thinking.

She further added to the reason why this generation seems to be so out-of-touch with the teachers' is that *"as teachers are almost at the bottom of social and financial appreciation, their life does not show that hard work and great knowledge may pay off,"* so they cannot function as a role model as they actually should, in her opinion. Finally, she mentioned how maintaining a united front by teachers towards students on values to be passed on would greatly ease everyday work at the school. She phrased it as follows: *"We have been changed by societal changes as well, we have begun to convey different values than we used to. By 'we' I mean teachers as*

a collective group. In my opinion there are many colleagues who do not project appropriate values and do not motivate their students in the appropriate way to want to know something, to want to become someone."

The third colleague, Sophie, was an abundant source of information, possibly due to her background in alternative teaching methods. She tries to use innovative techniques in her teaching but finds it challenging to make her students work hard and persistently towards a goal in the state system. She said that *"they avoid exerting any energy, which is reflected in how they would rather ask the teacher to tell them what to know for the exam instead of looking for information on their own. [...] Their motivation seems to work on the principles of business arrangement and not the pure satisfaction of knowing something."* For example, her 9th graders are interested, think for themselves and ask questions, but then they do not learn, that is, they do not memorize data. They lack the urge for precision and creativity and want to run on to the next task, to be done with it. They feel time spent on thinking about something is wasted. She believes

it is because they are overloaded, not in the fashionable sense of the word, but from a neurological perspective. They have to live in a 'noisy' world and have to spend time, for instance, sitting here in the school, sometimes for nothing. Because they are in a hurry all the time, they do not want to spend time studying. They are full of extracurricular activities, but they have to run there, too. They cannot distinguish between what is important or not. They don't have time to decide on that either. Of course, I don't want to generalize; there are exceptions to the rule.

When asked to work in groups to avoid the classical frontal teaching method, students do not cooperate, but *"rather work separately alongside each other because they do not want to adapt to the others,"* she said. They do help each other either when they are supposed to or when it is about cheating on a test. In addition, while being bored by frontal teaching, students still demand the centralized summary and the guidance of *"this is what I want you to know for the exam and test."* She also said that *"they love stories that colour the material but do not bother to remember them."* Furthermore, parents have strong expectations of the teachers. They ask at home about the syllabus the children have to learn from and the material to be covered from the textbooks. She highlighted that *"with these expectations at home, it is obvious that students will reiterate the same at school."* It is also easier and safer because if the student makes an effort, spends time thinking, and then their answer in the test is not correct, it has been a waste of time and energy as their mark will not reflect their efforts. However, she emphasized that *"by grades 11 and 12, students start to realize why I taught the material the way I did and realize I was right in doing so".*

She thinks this generation's nervous system is overloaded in a noisy world, where they are bombarded with too much information, or are taken from one lesson to the next even in their free time, so they have no time for anything. Everything is rushed. As a result, *"they cannot decide what is important and what is not. I have a feeling,"* she said, *"that it might be connected to smart phones, as using these devices on an everyday basis seems to change how students process information, which influences their learning techniques as well."*

Another issue she raised was the lack of respect towards teachers as members of the elder community. She can get respect if she raises her voice but when they are treated as equals, students' behaviour deteriorates to *"being very direct in a disrespectful way."* She thinks *"the lack of respect stems from a lack of trust that elders will provide safety; that they know more so younger ones can turn to them for guidance. This is what should be reflected in how one acts towards the older generation,"* she says, but the new generation does not seem to have this trust in previous ones.

5 Discussion

The data from the questionnaires and the interviews revealed that issues teachers talk about in the staff room may indeed be connected to value orientation differences between teachers and students, however difficult it is to 'measure' them. At first glance, the results of the questionnaire show relatively little numerical difference between the two groups of respondents, which could be interpreted as meaning that there is no difference between the values of the two groups. For instance, on collectivism the mean of the students is 2.165 with both the median and the mode at 2, whereas teachers' answers averaged 2.077, with the median and mode also both at 2. On power distance the means are 2.333 for students and 1.949 for teachers, a stronger difference, but the medians and the modes are both 2 and 2 respectively for both groups.

However, the data are meaningful if the contextual meaning of cultural value orientations is examined (Hofstede, 1995). The strongest differences on the Likert-scale section of the questionnaire were towards higher power distance, stronger diffuse, ascription, particularism, affect and outer orientation for students. Concerning the open-ended section, the need for more attention towards students reflects the value of femininity, the need for less structure can be interpreted as a sign of tolerating uncertainty and a wish for lower power distance. The need for comfort at the school as well, not only at home, can be interpreted as the value of a more diffuse school life for students. The need for more student life seems to reflect the value of more collectivism.

The issues raised in the interviews may also be connected to the dimensions of power distance (trust, respect and frontal teaching, canonization of material), uncertainty avoidance (trusting older generations, taking risks in group work, alternative learning methods, preference for frontal teaching), content validity of testing and the educational system (harmony of material, teaching methods and final exams), as well as achievement (past need to work hard for something, as opposed to entitlement (ascription) these days), and individualism (lack of real cooperation in group work, canonization versus individual opinion).

Students seem to tend towards both a higher and lower power distance than teachers, they expect guidance and a framework to work in to achieve the best results in their final exams, but they want to work as equal partners with the teacher, not to be treated as inferior underlings. Their need for proper guidance for test preparation seems to show a tendency towards uncertainty avoidance, while the higher scores towards ascribed values might reflect what society seems to suggest to them with celebrities and influencers around them: one does not have to put something down on the table to become someone. The tendency towards outer orientation reflects what they said in the interviews: namely, that it is easier to swallow their problems than to change the system. The tendency towards particularism can be detected in the fact that students find tests without proper content validity unfair. This practice evokes the idea that rules – of fairness, for example – do not apply to everyone. In addition, students' problems with learning the standard as opposed to being allowed to express their own opinion or work on the subject matter they are interested in seem to reflect a more individualistic attitude. Furthermore, the need for more social life and quality time among students reflects a collectivist preference. Finally, the complaint from teachers that students do not wish to work hard for goals but expect everything to fall into their laps because they are entitled to it represents a shift on the dimension of achievement – ascription.

It is true that other factors might be responsible for the above-mentioned differences. Firstly, the complaints of teachers simply might stem from the local school culture, and not constitute a widely observable phenomenon. Secondly, whether requirements have objectively increased or the older generations of teachers are just tired and the new generations of students are really less motivated and

willing to work hard remains to be confirmed. Thirdly, it is also possible that a strong uncertainty avoidance tendency in the national culture would result in the need to avoid change, or a tendency towards short term orientation would be reflected in the need to respect past traditions. All these could be influencing the values behind the National Curriculum, which in turn dictates what and how teachers and students can and should do in this institution.

Those who would like to see change in the present situation might have to accept that, as many scholars claim, culture is passed on, so cultural values might not be open to change. As Bennett points out (cited in Whalen, 2016) "... in a circular, self-referential process, the institutions of culture are constantly recreated by people enacting their experiences of those institutions" (p.7). It was mentioned in the teachers' interviews how parents expect the teachers to work in ways that correspond to their own memories of being students, thereby influencing current teachers to repeat the scenarios of the previous generation. This way of recreating the past is supported by Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov (2010) who go so far as to claim that "national value systems should be considered given facts, as hard as a country's geographical position or its weather" (p.20). Schwartz (2006) also maintains that cultural value orientations seem to be relatively stable, but he on the other hand allows for some gradual change due to the influence of societal changes, technological advances, being in touch with other cultures, or an increase in wealth. These might all lead to a different emphasis within value orientations.

Nevertheless, how stable culture is depends on factors exerting pressure on culture. As Minkov (2013) summarizes: "The available evidence suggests that the question of how stable or changeable culture is cannot have a definitive answer that is valid for all cases. It depends on the society, on the type and strength of factors that are exerting pressure on its culture, and on the kind of change that is measured" (p.24). Thus, if the types of pressure that influence the culture of Hungary these days could be identified, issues such as dissatisfaction with the educational system could be reacted to. Further research is however needed to see precisely what kind of adaptation the Hungarian educational system would need to undergo to function in a more balanced way.

6 Conclusion

The present research was conducted in a specific secondary institution to see whether there were underlying value orientation differences in the expectations on the part of students and teachers towards each other that had been reflected in constant complaining and finger-pointing among both groups. It was found that there are indeed value differences between the two groups, yet their statistical significance needs to be tested in the future. In addition, it was also confirmed that the problems recurring in staff room discussions seem to be linked to the cultural dimensions of power distance and uncertainty avoidance, as well as individualism, particularism, outer orientation, and ascription.

However, it was also reflected in some of the data that there might be independent reasons for the difference between students' and teachers' expectations. For example, the third teacher interview mentioned the washback effect of final exams, which seems to cause certain teaching and learning practices to remain unchanged despite having been reported as outdated, boring or not fit for the current generation of digital natives. Other characteristics of the educational framework that have emerged as problematic (such as the marking system or how students are treated by teachers) could change regardless of the academic output goals.

Based on the above, it would seem timely and relevant to conduct a national survey on the value orientations of the teaching community as well as parents

and students, together with an analysis of the National Curriculum from a value orientation point of view to determine what kind of value orientation the future changes should be based on. If the stakeholders of education were aware of each other's values concerning the role of teaching, the purpose of education and the output goals, it could help to harmonize expectations among parents, students and teachers, and thus to produce an overall better functioning, more efficient and well-balanced educational system.

References

- Barrett, M., Byram, M., Lázár, I., Mompoin-Gaillard, P., & Philippou, S. (2014). *Developing intercultural competence through education*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Bennett, M. J. (1986). A developmental approach to training intercultural sensitivity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 10(2), 179-196.
- Boeije, H. (2002). A purposeful approach to the constant comparative method in the analysis of qualitative interviews. *Quality and Quantity*, 36, 391-409.
- Bond, M. H. (1987). The Chinese connection (a team of 24 researchers). Chinese values and the search for culture-free dimensions of culture. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, 18(2), 143-164.
- Brown, D. H. (1986). Learning a second culture. In J. M. Valdes (Ed.), *Culture bound* (pp.33-47). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, D. H. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Chen, G. M., & Starosta, W. J. (1998). *Foundations of intercultural communication*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Cortazzi, M., & Jin, L. (1996). Cultures of learning: Language classrooms in China. In H. Coleman (Ed.), *Society and the language classroom* (pp.169-206). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Creswell, J. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York: Routledge.
- Furka, I. (2013). *Cultural value orientation studies in foreign language education in Hungary: Establishing a Hungarian cultural value orientation profile for application in foreign language education in Hungary*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five misunderstandings about case-study research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(2), 219-245.
- Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*. New York: Basic Books.
- Glaser, B.G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967/2006). *The discovery of grounded theory. Strategies for qualitative research*. New Brunswick: Aldine Transaction.
- Grobman, L. (2001). Toward a multicultural pedagogy: Literary and nonliterary traditions. *MELUS*, 26(1), 221-240.
- Groniewsky, D. (2001). *Kultúrákutás a globalizálódó világban – avagy "különbözőségünk" elemzése Hofstede nyomán*. [Researching culture in a globalizing world. Analyzing differences based on Hofstede]. Unpublished master's thesis, Corvinus University of Budapest, Institute of Management, Hungary.

- Hall, E. T. (1966). *The hidden dimension*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond culture*. Garden City, NY: Anchor/Doubleday.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences*. London: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1995). Multilevel research of human systems: Flowers, bouquets and gardens. *Human Systems Management*, 5(3), 207-217.
- Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. Revised and expanded 3rd edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hohman, M. (2013). Cultural humility: Lifelong practice. In Situ, the blog of the SDSU School of Social Work). <http://socialwork.sdsu.edu/insitu/diversity/cultural-humility-a-lifelong-practice/>
- Holló, D. (2008). *Értsünk szót!* [Let's understand each other]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Holló, D. (2014). Cultural dimensions and foreign language teaching. In J. Horváth, & P. Medgyes (Eds.), *Studies in honour of Marianne Nikolov* (pp.133-148). Pécs: Lingua Franca Csoport.
- Inglehart, R. F. (2008). *Changing values among western publics from 1970 to 2006*. Retrieved June 15, 2019 from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Inglehart_Ronald/publication/253550249_Changing_Values_Among_Western_Publics_from_1970_to_2006/links/56dccc7308aeelaa5f8746b3.pdf
- Jarjabka, Á. (2010). Hasonlóságok és különbségek a közép- és kelet-európai országok nemzeti szervezeti kultúrájában [Similarities and differences in the national-organizational culture of Central and Eastern European countries]. *BGF: A Magyar Tudomány Ünnepe 2010* (pp.178-194). Retrieved June 11, 2019 from <https://docplayer.hu/86681-Jarjabka-akos-hasonlosagok-es-kulonbsegek-a-kozep-es-keleteuropai-oroszagok-nemzeti-szervezeti-kulturajaban.html>
- Kolb, S. M. (2012). Grounded theory and the constant comparative method: Valid research strategies for educators. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies*, 3(1), 83-86. Retrieved June 15, 2019 from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.301.9451&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Jones, M. (2007). Hofstede – culturally questionable? Oxford Business & Economics Conference. Oxford, UK, 24-26 June, 2007. Retrieved on 13 June, 2019 from <https://ro.uow.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1389&context=commpapers>
- Lázár, I. (2006). *The role and status of intercultural communication training in English language teacher education in Hungary*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Budapest: Eötvös Loránd University.
- Levin, T. (2009). Re-Culturing beliefs in technology: Enriched classrooms. In L. Tan Wee Hin, & R. Subramaniam (Eds.), *Handbook of research on new media literacy at the K-12 level: Issues and challenges* (pp.144-166). Hershey, PA: Information Science reference. doi: 10.4018/978-1-60566-120-9.ch010
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Minkov, M. (2013). *Cross-cultural analysis: The science and art of comparing the world's modern societies and their cultures*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Nespor, J. (1987). The role of beliefs in the practice of teaching. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 19(4), 317-328.
- Rogers, C. R. (1983). *Freedom to learn for the 80's*. New York: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, A Bell & Howell Company.
- Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schwartz, S. H., & Sagiv, L. (1995). Identifying culture-specifics in the content and structure of values. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 26(1), 92-116.
- Schwartz, S. H. (2006). A theory of cultural value orientations: Explication and applications. *Comparative Sociology*, 5(2-3), 137-182.

- Schwartz, S. H. (2006). Les valeurs de base de la personne: Théorie, mesures et applications. [Basic human values: theory, measurement, and applications]. *Revue française desociologie*, 42, 249–288.
- Shaumjan, S. (2006). *Signs, mind, and reality: A theory of language as the folk model of the world*. Amsterdam—Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Sondergaard, M. (1994). Hofstede's consequences: A study of reviews, citations and replications. *Organization Studies*, 15, 447–456.
- Szokolszky, Á. (2004). *Kutatómunka a pszichológiában*. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó.
- Tarone, E., & Yule, G. (1989). *Focus on the language learner*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ting-Toomey, S., & Kurogi, A. (1998). Facework competence in intercultural conflict: an updated facenegotiation theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 22, 187–225.
- Trompenaars, F., & Hampden-Turner, C. (1998). *Riding the waves of culture. Understanding cultural diversity in business*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Trompenaars, F., & Woolliams, P. (2003). *Business across cultures*. Chichester: Capstone Publishing.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1980). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. New York: Harvard University Press.
- Waldron, N. L., & McLeskey, J. (2010). Establishing a collaborative school culture through comprehensive school reform. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 20, 58–74.
- Whalen, J. M. (2016). *The Hofstede model and national cultures of learning: A comparison of undergraduate survey data*. Unpublished master's thesis, Colorado State University, Colorado, USA.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Author data: Ildikó Furka has been an EFL teacher for 20 years. Her research interests stem from everyday situations she faces as a language instructor. Based on personal experience, she firmly believes in values shaping one's behaviour in the world. She is passionate about cultural value dimensions and how they help one see the Big Picture.

APPENDIX A

Student questionnaire: Value orientation survey among students in secondary education

Értékek az iskolában – értékorientációs felmérés az iskolai élet szereplői körében

Kedves Válaszoló!

Az alábbi kérdőív állításpárokat tartalmaz egy-egy, az iskolai életben is megjelenő értékkel, viselkedéssel kapcsolatban. A két állítás között lévő skálán azt az értéket jelölje meg, amelyik állítással egyetért. Válaszait név nélkül kezeljük, és a kutatási eredményeket kérésre megküldjük.

További információ az ildifurka@hotmail.com címen kérhető.

Köszönettel

dr. Furka Ildikó Zsuzsanna

Q1					
A tanárral mindent megbeszélve szeretek diákként dolgozni.	1	2	3	4	A tanár irányítsa a diákokat a munkában.
Q2	1	2	3	4	
A tanárokat nem tegezem, de jó lenne.					A tanárokat magázom, és ez így van jól.
Q3					
A tanár által mondottakat szemtől szemben is megkérdőjelezem, ha nem értek egyet vele, ez nem tiszteletlenség.	1	2	3	4	Nem kérdőjelezem meg a tanár által mondottakat, és nem mondok neki ellent szemtől szemben, mert az tiszteletlenség.
Q4					
Az osztályt és az osztályérdekeket előbbre helyezem az egyénnél és az egyéni érdekeknél.	1	2	3	4	Az egyént és az egyéni érdekeket előbbre tartom az osztálynál és a csoportérdeknél.
Q5					
Kitartok diáktársaim mellett, hiszen egy csapat vagyunk.	1	2	3	4	Diáktársaimmal köteleim viszonylag lazák, nem tartok ki mellettük minden áron.
Q6					
Törődöm a tanáraimmal, hiszen ők is törődnek velem.	1	2	3	4	Nem magától értetődő, hogy törődöm a tanáraimmal, mert függetlenek vagyunk.
Q7					
Azt szeretem, ha a fiú és lány diákok viselkedése nem kell, hogy eltérjen nemük miatt.	1	2	3	4	Azt szeretem, ha a fiú és lány diákok különbözően viselkednek a nemük miatt.
Q8					
Egy fiú diák is lehet törődő, odafigyelő, foglalkozhat a gyengébbekkel és a környezetével, ettől még nem kevésbé férfi.	1	2	3	4	Egy fiú diák legyen kemény, határozott, teljesítsen jól és ne foglalkozzon olyan dolgokkal, mint a környezet szépsége vagy a gyengébbek támogatása.
Q9					
Az együttműködést, egymás támogatását és az általános jólét elérését/fenntartását tartom diákként fontosnak.	1	2	3	4	A versenyszellemet tartom diákként fontosnak.
Q10					
A magánéletemet élesen elhatárolom az iskolai életemtől.	1	2	3	4	A magánéletem nem különül el élesen az iskolai életemtől.

Q11					
Nem zavar, ha nincs személyes kapcsolatom diáktársaimmal, ettől függetlenül tudok velük jól dolgozni, csak az iskolai feladatok erejéig érdekelnek.	1	2	3	4	Jobban meg kell ismernem a másik diákot ahhoz, hogy jól tudjak együtt dolgozni vele.
Q12					
Ha a tanárom megkér, hogy segítsék kifesteni a házát a hétvégén, egyértelműen nemet mondom, hiszen semmi közöm a magánéletéhez	1	2	3	4	Ha a tanárom megkér, hogy segítsék kifesteni a házát a hétvégén, igent mondom, hiszen a tanárral való viszonyomtól függ a tanulmányi előmenetelem
Q13					
Diákként az számít, ha teljesítek és elért pozíciómat nem veszem magától értetődőnek.	1	2	3	4	Az számít diákként, ha státuszom és kapcsolataim vannak, elért pozíciómnál a teljesítmény nem számít.
Q14					
Az iskolában diákként az a fontos, hogy keményen dolgozom, ennek mindig megvan a gyümölcse, és szorgalommal egyről a kettőre jutok.	1	2	3	4	Az iskolában az a fontos, hogy milyen a viszonyom a tanárral és nem az, hogy hogyan teljesítek nap mint nap.
Q15					
Egy tantárgyat azért veszek komolyan, mert hasznos tudni.	1	2	3	4	Egy tantárgyat, azért tanulok, mert státuszt képvisel és fontos leszek tőle.
Q16					
Nem mondom ki mindig mindent, mert ha valaki olvas a sorok között, úgy is tudja, mire gondoltam.	1	2	3	4	Mindig kimondok mindent, mert a sorok közötti jelentés mindenkinek más lehet.
Q17					
Diákként íratlan szabályokkal is jól tájékozódok az iskolai életben.	1	2	3	4	Diákként a leírt vagy egyértelműen kinyilatkoztatott szabályok szerint tájékozódok jól az iskolai életben.
Q18					
Diákként nem zavar, hogy ki kell találnom, ki mire gondol.	1	2	3	4	Diákként azt szeretem, ha mindent egyértelműen elmagyaráznak, és nem kell kitalálnom, ki mire gondol.

Q19					
A szabályokat az iskolai életben mindig minden körülmény között betartom.	1	2	3	4	A kapcsolataim építése és fenntartása fontosabb, ezért a szabályokat az iskolában nem mindig tartom be minden körülmények között.
Q20					
Diákként a szabályokat mindig mindenkre egyforma érvényűnek tartom, ezért akkor is jelentek valakit a megszegésükért, ha osztálytársam vagy barátom.	1	2	3	4	Diákként a szabályokat nem tartom mindenkre egyforma érvényűnek, és inkább segítek egy barátnak/osztálytársnak, minthogy időben az osztályba érjek vagy betartsam a szabályt.
Q21					
Mindenkire vonatkozó, általános és elvont erkölcsi szabályok alapján döntöm el, hogy mi a helyes és mi a helytelen	1	2	3	4	A szabályokat nem tartom mindenkre mindig egyformán vonatkozóknak, hanem más szempontokat is figyelembe lehet venni, lehet kivételezni.
Q22					
Nem mutatom ki az (akár pozitív vagy negatív) érzéseimet, mert az nem iskolai közegbe való.	1	2	3	4	Kimutatom az (akár pozitív vagy negatív) érzéseimet, ennek nincs köze a helyzethez, közeghez.
Q23					
Nem mutatom ki az (akár pozitív vagy negatív) érzéseimet, mert az gyerekes és irracionális.	1	2	3	4	Kimutatom az (akár pozitív vagy negatív) érzéseimet, mert ha nem tenném, titkolódnának és bizalmatlannak tünnék
Q24					
Nem akarom nagy hévvel a véleményem helyességéről meggyőzni a másik felet, akár változtatni is hajlandó vagyok rajta.	1	2	3	4	Hevesen védem meg az álláspontomat, amit nehezen változtatok meg.
Q25					
Diákként tudom irányítani és alakítani az életem és a környezetem.	1	2	3	4	Diákként elfogadom az életem és a környezetem úgy, ahogy van, alázatos vagyok.
Q26					
Saját motivációim, belső igényeim és vágyaim hajtanak előre.	1	2	3	4	Olyan külső erők motiválnak, mint a jegyek vagy a tanár utasításai.
Q27					
Ami velem történik, azt én okoztam, én vagyok a felelős.	1	2	3	4	Gyakran érzem úgy, hogy nem tudom irányítani az életem történéseit.

Q28					
Erőfeszítéseimnek azonnali eredményeket kell hozniuk, nem elég 5 év múlva beérniük.	1	2	3	4	Kitartóan kell azon dolgozom, hogy 5 év múlva is fenntarthassam a jelenlegi teljesítményemet, sikereimet.
Q29					
Nekem is meg kellennem azt, ami a többieknek van, ha nincs is rá pénzem.	1	2	3	4	A spórolást részesítem előnyben.
Q30					
A személyiségem állandó, olyan, ami nem változik helyzetről helyzetre, és jó úgy, ahogy van („Otthon és az iskolában is ugyanaz a személy vagyok” és „Mindig ugyanúgy viselkedem, bárkivel is vagyok”).	1	2	3	4	Még ha van is hibám, azt bizonyos tevékenységekkel fejlesztem, és hajlandó vagyok a célom elérése érdekében kompromisszumokat kötni.
Q31					
Saját magam vizsgálom meg a dolgokat, és el tudom fogadni, hogy az „lgazság” relatív	1	2	3	4	Egy abszolút „lgazság” létezik, és inkább a „közvéleményt”, a többiek véleményét fogadom el.
Q32					
Egy dolog/helyzet nemcsak fekete-fehér lehet, hanem szürke is, azaz IS-IS.	1	2	3	4	Feketén-fehéren gondolkodom, mindig VAGY-VAGY kell, hogy legyen egy dolog/helyzet.
Q33					
Nem zavar a változás, vagy az ismeretlen és váratlan helyzetek.	1	2	3	4	Nem alkalmazkodom jól a változásokhoz, az ismeretlen és a váratlan helyzetekhez.
Q34					
A határidőket betartom és pontos vagyok.	1	2	3	4	A határidőket nem tartom be szigorúan és nem vagyok pontos sem.
Q35					
Inkább elvégzem a feladatom először, és csak azután adok időt az emberi kapcsolatok ápolására.	1	2	3	4	Az emberi kapcsolatok ápolása fontosabb, mint az, hogy a feladatot minél hamarabb elvégezzem.
Q36					
Egyszerre csak egy dologra tudok koncentrálni, mindent alaposan megtervezek és beosztom az időmet.	1	2	3	4	Egyszerre több dolgot is tudok párhuzamosan végezni.

Adatok**Életkor kitöltéskor**

- 14 év
- 15 év
- 16 év
- 17 év
- 18 év
- 19 év
- 20 év

Nem

- nő
- férfi

Egyéb vélemény/észrevétel, ami az iskolai élettel kapcsolatos:

Email cím megadása, ha a kutatási eredményt szeretné megkapni:

APPENDIX B

**Teacher questionnaire:
Value orientation survey among teachers in secondary education**

Értékek az iskolában – értékorientációs felmérés az iskolai élet szereplői körében

Kedves Kolléga!

Az alábbi kérdőív állításpárokat tartalmaz egy-egy, az iskolai életben is megjelenő értékkel, viselkedéssel kapcsolatban. Az állításpárok egy skála két végpontját jelölik. A skálán azt az értéket jelölje meg, amelyik végponttal inkább egyetért. Válaszait név nélkül kezeljük, és a kutatási eredményeket kérésre megküldjük.

További információ az ildifurka@hotmail.com címen kérhető.

Köszönettel
dr. Furka Ildikó Zsuzsanna

Q1					
A diákkal mindent megbeszélve szeretek tanárként dolgozni.	1	2	3	4	A tanár irányítsa a diákokat a munkában.
Q2	1	2	3	4	
A diákokat tegezem, ez a természetes					A diákokat magázom, és ez így van jól.
Q3					
Ha a diák megkérdőjelezi az általam mondottakat szemtől szemben, ha nem ért vele egyet, az nem tiszteletlenség.	1	2	3	4	A diák nem kérdőjelezi meg az általam mondottakat, és nem mond nekem ellent szemtől szemben, mert az tiszteletlenség.
Q4					
Az iskolában a tanári kart és az iskolaérdekeket előbbre helyezem az egyénnél és az egyéni érdekeknél.	1	2	3	4	Az iskolában az egyént és az egyéni érdekeket előbbre tartom a tanári karnál és az iskolaérdekeknél
Q5					
Kitartok tanártársaim mellett, hiszen egy csapat vagyunk.	1	2	3	4	Tanártársaimmal köteleim viszonylag lazák, nem tartok ki mellettük minden áron.
Q6					
Törődöm a diákjaimmal, hiszen ők is törődnek velem.	1	2	3	4	Nem magától értetődő, hogy törődöm a diákjaimmal, hiszen függetlenek vagyunk.
Q7					
Azt szeretem, ha a fiú és lány diákok viselkedése nem kell, hogy eltérjen nemük miatt.	1	2	3	4	Azt szeretem, ha a fiú és lány diákok különbözően viselkednek a nemük miatt.

Q8					
Egy fiú diák is lehet törődő, odafigyelő, foglalkozhat a gyengébbekkel és a környezetével, ettől még nem kevésbé férfi.	1	2	3	4	Egy fiú diák legyen kemény, határozott, teljesítsen jól és ne foglalkozzon olyan dolgokkal, mint a környezet szépsége vagy a gyengébbek támogatása.
Q9					
Az együttműködést, egymás támogatását és az általános jólét elérését/fenntartását tartom tanárként fontosnak.	1	2	3	4	A versenyszellemet tartom tanárként fontosnak.
Q10					
A magánéletemet élesen elhatárolom az iskolai életemtől.	1	2	3	4	A magánéletem nem különül el élesen az iskolai életemtől.
Q11					
Nem zavar, ha nincs személyes kapcsolatom tanártársaimmal, ettől függetlenül tudok velük jól dolgozni, csak az iskolai feladatok erejéig érdekelnek.	1	2	3	4	Jobban meg kell ismernem a másik tanárt ahhoz, hogy jól tudjak együtt dolgozni vele.
Q12					
Ha a főnököm megkér, hogy segítek kifesteni a házát a hétvégén, egyértelműen nemet mondom, hiszen semmi közöm a magánélethez	1	2	3	4	Ha a főnököm megkér, hogy segítek kifesteni a házát a hétvégén, igent mondom, hiszen a főnökömmel való viszonyomtól függ a tanulmányi előmenetelem.
Q13					
Tanárként az számít, ha teljesítek és elért pozíciómat nem veszem magától értetődőnek.	1	2	3	4	Az számít tanárként, ha státuszom és kapcsolataim vannak, elért pozíciómnál a teljesítmény nem számít.
Q14					
Az iskolában tanárként az a fontos, hogy keményen dolgozom, ennek mindig megvan a gyümölcse, és szorgalommal egyről a kettőre jutok.	1	2	3	4	Az iskolában az a fontos, hogy milyen a viszonyom a főnökkel és nem az, hogy hogyan teljesítek nap mint nap.
Q15					
Egy továbbképzést - ami nem kötelező - azért végzek el, mert hasznosat tanulok.	1	2	3	4	Egy továbbképzést - ami nem kötelező -, azért végzek el, mert státuszt képvisel és fontos leszek tőle.

Q16					
Nem mondom ki mindig mindent, mert ha valaki olvas a sorok között, úgy is tudja, mire gondoltam.	1	2	3	4	Mindig kimondok mindent, mert a sorok közötti jelentés mindenkinek más lehet.
Q17					
Tanárként íratlan szabályokkal is jól tájékozódok az iskolai életben.	1	2	3	4	Tanárként a leírt vagy egyértelműen kinyilatkoztatott szabályok szerint tájékozódok jól az iskolai életben.
Q18					
Tanárként nem zavar, hogy ki kell találnom, ki mire gondol.	1	2	3	4	Tanárként azt szeretem, ha mindent egyértelműen elmondanak, és nem kell kitalálnom, ki mire gondol.
Q19					
A szabályokat az iskolai életben mindig minden körülmény között betartom.	1	2	3	4	A kapcsolataim, és azok építése és fenntartása fontosabb, ezért a szabályokat az iskolában nem mindig tartom be minden körülmények között.
Q20					
Tanárként a szabályokat mindig mindenkire egyforma érvényűnek tartom, ezért akkor is jelentek valakit a megszegésükért, ha kollégám vagy barátom.	1	2	3	4	Tanárként a szabályokat nem tartom mindenkire egyforma érvényűnek, és inkább segítek egy barátnak/kollégának vagy diáknak, minthogy időben az osztályba érjek vagy betartsam a szabályt.
Q21					
Mindenkire vonatkozó, általános és elvont erkölcsi szabályok alapján döntöm el, hogy mi a helyes és mi a helytelen.	1	2	3	4	A szabályokat nem tartom mindenkire mindig egyformán vonatkozóknak, hanem más szempontokat is figyelembe lehet venni, lehet kivételezni.
Q22					
Nem mutatom ki az (akár pozitív vagy negatív) érzéseimet, mert az nem iskolai közegbe való.	1	2	3	4	Kimutatom az (akár pozitív vagy negatív) érzéseimet, ennek nincs köze a helyzethez, közeghez.
Q23					
Nem mutatom ki az (akár pozitív vagy negatív) érzéseimet, mert az gyerekes és irracionális	1	2	3	4	Kimutatom az (akár pozitív vagy negatív) érzéseimet, mert ha nem tenném, titkolódzóknak és bizalmatlannak tünnék.

Q24					
Nem akarom nagy hévvel a véleményem helyességéről meggyőzni a másik felet, akár változtatni is hajlandó vagyok rajta.	1	2	3	4	Hevesen védem meg az álláspontomat, amit nehezen változtatok meg.
Q25					
Tanárként tudom irányítani és alakítani az életem és a környezetem.	1	2	3	4	Tanárként elfogadom az életem és a környezetem úgy, ahogy van, alázatos vagyok.
Q26					
Saját motivációim, belső igényeim és vágyaim hajtanak előre.	1	2	3	4	Olyan külső erők motiválnak, mint a pénz vagy a főnök utasításai.
Q27					
Ami velem történik, azt én okoztam, én vagyok a felelős.	1	2	3	4	Gyakran érzem úgy, hogy nem tudom irányítani az életem történéseit.
Q28					
Erőfeszítéseimnek azonnali eredményeket kell hozniuk, nem elég 5 év múlva beérniük.	1	2	3	4	Kitartóan kell azon dolgozom, hogy 5 év múlva is fenntarthatassam a jelenlegi teljesítményemet, sikereimet.
Q29					
Nekem is meg kell vennem azt, ami a többieknek van, ha nincs is rá pénzem.	1	2	3	4	A spórolást részesítem előnyben.
Q30					
A személyiségem állandó, olyan, ami nem változik helyzetről helyzetre, és jó úgy, ahogy van („Otthon és az iskolában is ugyanaz a személy vagyok” és „Mindig ugyanúgy viselkedem, bárkivel is vagyok”).	1	2	3	4	Még ha van is hibám, azt bizonyos tevékenységekkel fejlesztem, és hajlandó vagyok a célom elérése érdekében kompromisszumokat kötni.
Q31					
Saját magam vizsgálom meg a dolgokat, és el tudom fogadni, hogy az „Igazság” relatív.	1	2	3	4	Egy abszolút „Igazság” létezik, és inkább a „közvéleményt”, a többiek véleményét fogadom el.
Q32					
Egy dolog/helyzet nemcsak fekete-fehér lehet, hanem szürke is, azaz IS-IS.	1	2	3	4	Feketén-fehéren gondolkodom, mindig VAGY-VAGY kell, hogy legyen egy dolog/helyzet.

Q33					
Nem zavar a változás, vagy az ismeretlen és váratlan helyzetek.	1	2	3	4	Nem alkalmazkodom jól a változásokhoz, az ismeretlen és a váratlan helyzetekhez.
Q34					
A határidőket betartom és pontos vagyok.	1	2	3	4	A határidőket nem tartom be szigorúan és nem vagyok pontos sem.
Q35					
Inkább elvégzem a feladatom először, és csak azután adok időt az emberi kapcsolatok ápolására.	1	2	3	4	Az emberi kapcsolatok ápolása fontosabb, mint az, hogy a feladatot minél hamarabb elvégezzem.
Q36					
Egyszerre csak egy dologra tudok koncentrálni, mindent alaposan megtervezek és beosztom az időmet.	1	2	3	4	Egyszerre több dolgot is tudok párhuzamosan végezni.

Adatok:**Életkor kitöltéskor**

- 20–24
- 25–29
- 30–34
- 35–39
- 40–44
- 45–49
- 50–54
- 55–59
- 60–64
- 65–69
- 70–75

Nem:

- nő
- férfi

Egyéb vélemény/észrevétel, ami az iskolai élettel kapcsolatos:

Email cím megadása, ha a kutatási eredményt szeretné megkapni:

APPENDIX C**Student interview schedule**

- Question 1: What problems do you see in the educational system?
- Questions 2: What causes conflicts between you and your teachers?
- Questions 3: Why do you think these become problems?
- Question 4: What would you expect of your teachers?
- Question 5: Is there anything you as a student should do differently according to your teachers, but you don't, because other things are important for you?
- Question 6: What is important for you as a student?
- Question 7: What would you expect the educational system to be like?

Teacher interview schedule

- Question 1: What problems do you see in the educational system?
- Questions 2: What causes conflicts between you and your students?
- Question 3: Are students these days different from previous generations?
- Question 4: Do you think the reason behind the problems are due to the new generational differences? If so, how?
- Questions 5: Why do you think these become problems?
- Question 6: What would you expect of your students?
- Question 7: What is important for you as a teacher?
- Question 8: What would you expect the educational system to be like?